arXiv:1612.06095v1 [math.DS] 19 Dec 2016

# THE INFIMUM OF LIPSCHITZ CONSTANTS IN THE CONJUGACY CLASS OF AN INTERVAL MAP

JOZEF BOBOK AND SAMUEL ROTH

Abstract. How can we interpret the infimum of Lipschitz constants in a conjugacy class of interval maps? For positive entropy maps, the exponential of the topological entropy gives a well-known lower bound. We show that for piecewise monotone maps, these two quantities are equal, but for countably piecewise monotone maps, the inequality can be strict. Moreover, in the transitive and Markov case, we characterize the infimum of Lipschitz constants as the exponential of the Salama entropy of a certain reverse Markov chain associated with the map. Dynamically, this number represents the exponential growth rate of the number of iterated preimages of nearly any point.

## 1. Introduction

There is a long history in interval dynamics relating Lipschitz constants with topological entropy. Under suitable assumptions on the map $f : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$, and letting $\lambda = \exp h(f)$ denote the exponential of the topological entropy of $f$, there are constructions for

- a conjugate map[1] $g$ with Lipschitz constant $\lambda$,
  - Parry [13], for $f$ piecewise monotone and transitive.
- a factor map[2] $g$ with Lipschitz constant $\lambda$,
  - Milnor-Thurston [11], for $f$ piecewise monotone, $h(f) > 0$,
- an extension map[3] $g$ with Lipschitz constant $\lambda$,
  - Bobok [4], for $f$ mixing, $h(f) < \infty$, and $f(0, 1) \supset \{0, 1\}$.

In each construction $g$ inherits the same entropy as $f$, and we may say that its Lipschitz constant is best possible, in the sense that a positive-entropy interval map cannot have a Lipschitz constant smaller than the exponential of its entropy.

The present paper continues Parry's line of research in the following sense: *Given an interval map $f$, we seek to construct conjugate maps with Lipschitz constants as small as possible.* Here are our main results. For $f$ piecewise monotone (not necessarily transitive), we find, not surprisingly, that we can construct conjugate maps with Lipschitz constants as close as we want to $\exp h(f)$ (Theorem 3.6). But for general $f$, there sometimes arises an unexpected gap between $\exp h(f)$ and the infimum of Lipschitz constants among conjugate maps (Example 4.14).

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 37E05, Secondary: 26A16, 37B40.

*Key words and phrases.* interval maps.

[1] In fact, $g$ is piecewise linear with slope $\pm\lambda$ on each piece.

[2] Again with "constant slope" $\pm\lambda$. By sacrificing transitivity, Milnor and Thurston obtain a (nondecreasing) semiconjugacy in place of Parry's conjugacy.

[3] Here, $g$ need not be piecewise linear. The extension is nondecreasing in the sense that $\phi \circ g = f \circ \phi$ for some nondecreasing map $\phi : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$

Indeed, for $f$ transitive with a countable Markov partition, we prove that the infimum of Lipschitz constants corresponds not to the entropy, but to the growth rate $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{\#f^{-n}(\{x\})}$ of the number of preimages of an arbitrary point $x$, provided $x$ is not an accumulation point of the Markov partition set. (Theorem 4.11).

## 2. Statement of the Problem

A map $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is Lipschitz continuous with *Lipschitz constant* $\lambda$ if

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \le \lambda |x - y|, \qquad x, y \in [0,1]. \tag{1}$$

Lipschitz constants can sometimes be improved by replacing a map with a conjugate map. We denote the infimum of Lipschitz constants in a topological conjugacy class of interval maps as follows:

$$\Lambda(f) = \inf\{\lambda : \text{for some homeomorphism } \psi : [0,1] \to [0,1], \\ \psi \circ f \circ \psi^{-1} \text{ has Lipschitz constant } \lambda\}.$$

The main motivation of this work is to answer the following question: *How can we characterize the infimum of Lipschitz constants in the conjugacy class of an interval map?*

**Example 2.1.** $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$, $f(x) = x^2$, has (best) Lipschitz constant 2. Moreover, $\Lambda(f) = 1$ and is not attained.

*Proof.* $g_t : [0,1] \to [0,1], t \in (1,\infty)$, $g_t(x) = x^t$ has Lipschitz constant $t$, and $\psi_t \circ f = g_t \circ \psi_t$, where $\psi_t(x) = e^{-(\ln 1/x)^{\log_2 t}}$ (with values at the endpoints given by continuity). However, any map conjugate to $f$ fixes 0 and 1 but not $\frac{1}{2}$, and thus cannot have Lipschitz constant 1. We remark that by taking $t \in (0,1)$, we obtain maps in the conjugacy class which are not even Lipschitz continuous. □

Since Lipschitz constants can be changed under topological conjugacy, the reader may wonder if Lipschitz constants have any relevance in topological dynamics. Actually, there is a well-known proposition connecting Lipschitz continuity with the topological dynamics of interval maps.

**Proposition 2.2** ([7])**.** *Suppose $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ has Lipschitz constant $\lambda$. Then we have the following bound for the topological entropy of $f$,*

$$h(f) \le \max\{0, \log \lambda\}.$$

We can considerably simplify the statements of our main results by making the following mild assumption throughout the paper:

**Standing Assumption 2.3.** *We ignore interval maps $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ for which $\cap_{i=0}^{\infty} f^i([0,1])$ is a singleton.*

We will denote by $C([0,1])$ the class of those continuous maps $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ which satisfy assumption 2.3. The following facts hold for each map $f \in C([0,1])$.

- $f$ cannot have Lipschitz constant $\lambda < 1$. Otherwise it would be a uniform contraction, with a unique fixed point attracting the entire interval.
- Consequently, the conclusion of Proposition 2.2 simplifies to $h(f) \le \log \lambda$.
- Since assumption 2.3 is conjugacy-invariant, we get also $\Lambda(f) \ge 1$.

**Corollary 2.4.** *Let $f \in C([0,1])$. Then $\Lambda(f) \ge \exp h(f)$.*

*Proof.* All maps in the conjugacy class of $f$ have the same topological entropy, giving the same lower bound for their Lipschitz constants. □

Corollary 2.4 gives a partial answer to our main question, namely, that the entropy of $f$ determines a lower bound for $\Lambda(f)$. We are left with the natural question whether or not this lower bound is sharp. It turns out that for piecewise monotone maps the bound is sharp (Section 3), but for general interval maps it need not be (Section 4).

We conclude this section with a short proof of Proposition 2.2. We hope to give the reader some intuition regarding the relationship between Lipschitz constants and entropy for interval maps.

*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* We use Bowen's definition of topological entropy. A set $E \subset [0,1]$ is $(n,\epsilon)$-separated if for all distinct $x, y \in E$ there is $i \in \{0,\dots,n\}$ such that $|f^n(x) - f^n(y)| > \epsilon$. Then $h(f) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log s_f(n,\epsilon)$, where $s_f(n,\epsilon)$ is the maximum cardinality of an $(n,\epsilon)$-separated set.

By the Lipschitz continuity of $f$, if $E$ is $(n,\epsilon)$-separated, then for all distinct $x, y \in E$, we have $|x - y| > \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda^n}$. A set with this property in the interval $[0,1]$ can contain no more than $\frac{\lambda^n}{\epsilon} + 1$ elements, so $s_f(n,\epsilon) \leq \frac{\lambda^n}{\epsilon} + 1$. Sending $n \to \infty$ and $\epsilon \to 0$, the proposition is proved. □

## 3. Piecewise Monotone Maps

An interval map $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is called *piecewise monotone* if there is a finite set $P$ such that $f|_I$ is monotone on each component $I$ of the complement of $P$. The main tool that allows us to work with piecewise monotone maps (without the need for any Markov assumption) is the notion of total variation.

**Definition 3.1.** The *total variation* of a real-valued function $f : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is

$$\operatorname{Var} f := \sup \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} |f(p_{i+1}) - f(p_i)|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite sequences $p_0 < p_1 < \cdots < p_s$ of elements of the domain $[a,b]$.

Combining the notions of total variation and iteration, we obtain

**Definition 3.2.** The *upper growth rate of variation* of a map $f \in C([0,1])$ is

$$\nu^*(f) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{\operatorname{Var} f^n},$$

The *growth rate of variation* is given by the limit, if it exists,

$$\nu(f) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{\operatorname{Var} f^n}.$$

For piecewise monotone maps, the growth rate of variation has a dynamical meaning – it corresponds with the topological entropy of the map. This result was discovered by Misiurewicz and Szlenk.

**Theorem 3.3** ([1, 10])**.** *Let $f \in C([0,1])$ be piecewise monotone. Then the growth rate of variation exists and is equal*[4] *to the exponential of the topological entropy, $\nu(f) = \exp h(f)$.*

As a side remark, this shows that $\nu(\cdot)$ is a conjugacy invariant for piecewise monotone maps. We warn the reader that for general maps from $C([0,1])$, there is no conjugacy invariance for $\nu(\cdot)$, just as there is no conjugacy invariance for Lipschitz constants.

If we form a certain weighted sum of the total variation of the iterates of a map $f$, then we can construct interval maps conjugate to $f$ having Lipschitz constants arbitrarily close to $\nu^*(f)$.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Suppose $f \in C([0,1])$ and $\nu^*(f) < \infty$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Let*

$$\phi(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\operatorname{Var} f^n|_{[0,x]}}{(\nu^*(f)+\epsilon)^n}. \tag{2}$$

*Then $\phi(1) < \infty$, $\phi$ is a homeomorphism onto its image, and $\phi \circ f \circ \phi^{-1}$ has Lipschitz constant $\nu^*(f) + \epsilon$.*

To prove Proposition 3.4, we need a lemma regarding total variation. If $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, then, regardless of their ordering, we will denote by $[x; y]$ the closed interval whose endpoints are $x$ and $y$.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let $f \in C([0,1])$, $x, y \in [0,1]$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $Var f^n|_{[f(x);f(y)]} \leq Var f^{n+1}|_{[x;y]}$*

*Proof.* If $x = y$ or $f(x) = f(y)$ then the proof is trivial. We suppose without loss of generality that $x < y$. Consider first the case when $f(x) < f(y)$. Let $p_0 < p_1 < \cdots < p_s$ be any finite sequence of points from the interval $[f(x), f(y)]$. We use recursion to find a sequence $p'_0 < p'_1 < \cdots < p'_s$ of points in the interval $[x, y]$ such that $f(p'_i) = p_i$, $i = 0, \ldots, s$. We find $p'_0$ by applying the intermediate value theorem to $f$ on the interval $[x, y]$. Having found $p'_i$, we find $p'_{i+1}$ by applying the intermediate value theorem to $f$ on the interval $[p'_i, y]$, remembering that $p_{i+1}$ lies between $f(p'_i)$ and $f(y)$. By construction, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{s} |f^{n+1}(p'_{i+1}) - f^{n+1}(p'_i)| = \sum_{i=1}^{s} |f^n(p_{i+1}) - f^n(p_i)|$. Since $p_0 < p_1 < \cdots < p_s$ was an arbitrary finite sequence from the interval $[f(x), f(y)]$, we may pass to the supremum and the result follows.

Now consider the case when $f(y) < f(x)$. The proof proceeds as before, except that the intermediate value theorem produces points $p'_0 > p'_1 > \cdots > p'_s$ with the reverse ordering in the interval $[x, y]$. This makes no difference when we calculate total variation. □

*Proof of Proposition 3.4.* By the definition of $\nu^*$, we have $\operatorname{Var} f^n \leq (\nu^*(f) + \frac{\epsilon}{2})^n$ for all $n$ greater than or equal to some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Applying the comparison test with the geometric series

$$\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \frac{(\nu^*(f) + \frac{\epsilon}{2})^n}{(\nu^*(f)+\epsilon)^n}, \tag{3}$$

we conclude that $\phi(1)$ is finite.

[4]The statement of Theorem 3.3 in the original literature is slightly more complicated, allowing for the possibility that $\nu^*(f) < 1$. This is impossible under our standing assumption 2.3, since $\operatorname{Var} f^n$ is bounded away from zero by the length of the interval $\cap_{i=0}^{\infty} f^i([0,1])$.

We have a trivial inequality $\operatorname{Var} f^n|_{[0,x]} \leq \operatorname{Var} f^n$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. Therefore we can use the same geometric series (3) in the Weierstrass M-test to conclude that the series in (2) converges uniformly. Then $\phi$, being a uniform limit of continuous functions, is continuous.

Since $f^0$ is the identity function, we have $\operatorname{Var} f^0|_{[0,x]} = x$, and we may write $\phi(x) = x + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\operatorname{Var} f^n|_{[0,x]}}{(\nu^*(f)+\epsilon)^n}$. Now it is clear that $\phi$ is strictly monotone increasing.

The last three paragraphs combined show that $\phi : [0,1] \to [0,\phi(1)]$ is a homeomorphism onto its image. Therefore we can form the composition $g = \phi \circ f \circ \phi^{-1}$.

If $x, y \in [0,1]$, then by (2) we have

$$\Big|g(\phi(y)) - g(\phi(x))\Big| = \Big|\phi(f(y)) - \phi(f(x))\Big| = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{Var f^n|_{[f(x);f(y)]}}{(\nu^*(f)+\epsilon)^n} \leq \cdots,$$

which by Lemma 3.5 becomes

$$\cdots \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{Var f^{n+1}|_{[x,y]}}{(\nu^*(f)+\epsilon)^n} = (\nu^*(f)+\epsilon) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{Var f^n|_{[x,y]}}{(\nu^*(f)+\epsilon)^n} \leq \cdots$$

Adding back a term with index zero and again applying (2), we get

$$\cdots \leq (\nu^*(f)+\epsilon) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{Var f^n|_{[x,y]}}{(\nu^*(f)+\epsilon)^n} = (\nu^*(f)+\epsilon)\Big|\phi(y) - \phi(x)\Big|.$$

Since $\phi : [0,1] \to [0,\phi(1)]$ is surjective, this shows that $g$ has Lipschitz constant $\nu^*(f) + \epsilon$. Finally, by rescaling $g$, (conjugating by a linear homeomorphism $[0,\phi(1)] \to [0,1]$), we get a map on the unit interval $[0,1]$ conjugate to $f$ with Lipschitz constant $\nu^*(f) + \epsilon$. □

Combining Proposition 3.4 with Theorem 3.3, we find that for piecewise monotone interval maps, the infimum of Lipschitz constants among conjugate maps is given by the topological entropy.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let $f \in C([0,1])$ be piecewise monotone. Then $\Lambda(f) = \exp h(f)$.*

*Proof.* The inequality $\Lambda(f) \geq \exp h(f)$ is just Corollary 2.4. For the reverse inequality, we notice that if $f$ is piecewise monotone, then by Theorem 3.3, $\nu^*(f) = \nu(f) = \exp h(f)$. Thus Proposition 3.4 produces for each $\epsilon > 0$ a map conjugate to $f$ with Lipschitz constant $\exp h(f) + \epsilon$. Therefore $\Lambda(f) \leq \exp h(f)$. □

## 4. Transitive Maps with a Countable Markov Partition

We turn our attention now to continuous interval maps which are transitive and countably Markov.

*Transitivity* of $f$ means that for each pair of nonempty open sets $U, V$, there is $n \geq 0$ such that $f^n(U) \cap V \neq \emptyset$. On the unit interval, transitivity is equivalent (see [16]) to the existence of a point $x$ with a dense forward orbit $\{x, f(x), f^2(x), \ldots\}$. Thus, for transitive interval maps, our Standing Assumption 2.3 becomes extraneous and may be dropped.

There is very little difference between transitive interval maps and (topologically) mixing interval maps. *Mixing* means that for each pair of nonempty open sets $U, V$, we have $f^n(U) \cap V \neq \emptyset$ for all sufficiently large $n$.

**Lemma 4.1** ([2, 3])**.** *If the interval map $f$ is transitive but not mixing, then $[0,1]$ decomposes into two pieces $L=[0,c]$ and $R=[c,1]$ such that $f(L)=R$, $f(R)=L$, and both of the maps $f^2|_L : L \to L$ and $f^2|_R : R \to R$ are mixing.*

An interval map $f$ is said to be *countably Markov* if there is a closed and countable set $P$, $0,1 \in P$, which is forward invariant $f(P) \subset P$, and such that $f|_I$ is monotone on each component $I$ of $[0,1] \setminus P$. Such a set $P$ will be called a *partition set* for $f$. We denote by $\mathcal{B}(P)$ the set of all components of $[0,1] \setminus P$, and we call these components the *partition intervals*.

We import several notions from symbolic dynamics. To a countably Markov map $f$ with partition set $P$ we associate a 0-1 valued *transition matrix* $A = A(f,P)$ with rows and columns indexed by the partition intervals and entries

$$A(I,J) = \begin{cases} 1, & f(I) \supset J \\ 0, & f(I) \cap J = \emptyset \end{cases},$$

and because of the Markov property (forward-invariance of the partition set), one of these two conditions must hold.

The basic properties of Markov partitions as regards iteration are summarized in the next lemma.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose $f$ is transitive and countably Markov with partition set $P$. Then*

(i) *$P^n := \cup_{i=0}^n f^{-i}(P)$ defines a Markov partition for $f^j$, provided $j \le n+1$.*
(ii) *The partition intervals of $P^n$ are the nonempty intervals of the form*
$$[I_0 I_1 \cdots I_n] := I_0 \cap f^{-1} I_1 \cap \cdots \cap f^{-n} I_n, \quad \text{where } I_0, \ldots, I_n \in \mathcal{B}(P).$$
(iii) *For each $[I_0 \cdots I_n] \neq \emptyset$, the restricted map $f^n|_{[I_0 \cdots I_n]} : [I_0 \cdots I_n] \to [I_n]$ is a homeomorphism.*
(iv) *The set of accumulation points of $P$ is forward invariant, $f(\mathrm{Acc}\ P) \subset P$.*
(v) *$Q := \cup_{n=0}^\infty P^n = \cup_{i=0}^\infty f^{-i}(P)$ is dense in $[0,1]$.*

*Proof.* The ideas here are essentially the same as in the theory of finite Markov partitions. We include the argument for the sake of completeness.

(i) Clearly $P^n$ is closed, contains 0 and 1 and is forward invariant. Since $f$ is transitive, it must be *strictly* monotone on each of its partition intervals, and therefore the preimage of any singleton is countable. It follows that $P^n$ is countable. If $U$ is a component of $[0,1] \setminus P^n$, then the sets $U$, $f(U)$, …, $f^n(U)$ contain no point from $P$. Thus for $j \le n$, $f^j|_U$ is a composition of monotone maps, and so is monotone.

(ii) If $[I_0 \cdots I_{n-1}]$ is an interval, then so is $[I_0 \cdots I_n] = \left(f^n|_{[I_0 \cdots I_{n-1}]}\right)^{-1}(I_n)$, by (i). Using induction, we see that all nonempty sets of the form $[I_0 \cdots I_n]$ are intervals. If $x$ belongs to some interval $[I_0 \cdots I_n]$, then $f^n(x)$ belongs to $I_n$, hence does not belong to $P$, and therefore $x \notin P^n$. Thus each interval $[I_0 \cdots I_n]$ contains no points from $P^n$, and so is contained in one of the component intervals of $[0,1] \setminus P^n$. Conversely, if $U$ is a component of $[0,1] \setminus P^n$, then it is contained in the interval $[I_0 \cdots I_n]$, where $I_i$ is taken to be the member of $\mathcal{B}(P)$ containing $f^i(U)$, $i = 0, \ldots, n$. The claim follows.

(iii) By (i) and (ii), $f^n$ maps $[I_0 \cdots I_n]$ monotonically into $I_n$. It remains to prove surjectivity. By (ii), the endpoints of $[I_0 \cdots I_{n-1}]$ belong to $P^{n-1}$. Therefore the endpoints of $V = f^n([I_0 \cdots I_{n-1}])$ belong to $P$. Since $I_n$

contains no points of $P$ and $[I_0 \cdots I_n] \neq \emptyset$ by hypothesis, it follows that $I_n \subset V$. The claim follows.

(iv) If a point $x \in P$ is a limit of a sequence of points $x_n$ from $P$, then the points $f(x_n)$ also belong to $P$ and converge to $f(x)$.

(v) We may assume that $f$ is mixing. Otherwise we simply repeat the proof for each of the maps $f^2|_L$, $f^2|_R$ given by Lemma 4.1, which are countably Markov and mixing for the sets $P^2 \cap L$, $P^2 \cap R$, respectively. Fix two distinct partition intervals $I, J$, and let $U$ be any nonempty open set. By the mixing property we can find a common value of $n$ so that $f^n(U) \cap I \neq \emptyset$ and $f^n(U) \cap J \neq \emptyset$. Since there is a point of $P$ between $I$ and $J$, it follows by the intermediate value theorem that $U$ contains a point of $P^n$. □

### 4.1. Subeigenvectors and Conjugate Maps

Let $A$ be a nonnegative matrix with countable index set $S$. We will say that $\lambda$ is a *subeigenvalue* and that $v$ is a *$\lambda$-subeigenvector* of the matrix $A$ if there is coordinate-wise inequality

$$\sum_{j \in S} A_{ij} v_j \leq \lambda v_i, \quad i \in S.$$

We say $v$ is *deficient in coordinate $i$* if there is strict inequality $\sum_{j \in S} A_{ij} v_j < \lambda v_i$.

**Proposition 4.3.** *Suppose $f$ is countably Markov with partition set $P$. If $f$ admits a conjugate map with some Lipschitz constant $\lambda$, then its transition matrix admits a positive, summable $\lambda$-subeigenvector.*

*Proof.* Suppose $g = \psi \circ f \circ \psi^{-1}$ has Lipschitz constant $\lambda$. Define $v_I = |\psi(I)|$, $I \in \mathcal{B}(P)$ where vertical bars $|\cdot|$ denote the length of an interval. Then

$$(Av)_I = \sum_{J \subseteq f(I)} v_J = \sum_{J \subseteq f(I)} |\psi(J)| = |g(\psi(I))| \leq \lambda |\psi(I)| = \lambda v_I$$

where the inequality follows from the Lipschitz property of $g$. □

The next theorem is a partial converse to Proposition 4.3.

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let $f$ be transitive and countably Markov with partition set $P$. If the associated transition matrix admits a positive, summable $\lambda$-subeigenvector which is deficient in only finitely many coordinates, then $f$ admits a conjugate map with Lipschitz constant $\lambda$.*

Heuristically, the proof may be summarized as follows. Our candidate for a conjugate map is a piecewise affine map $g$ which has an identical Markov structure as $f$ but takes the entries of the subeigenvector as the lengths of its partition intervals. In this way $g$ has constant slope $\lambda$ except on the intervals where the eigenvector was deficient – and there it has even smaller slope. Our candidate for the conjugacy $\psi$ is the map that identifies points between the two systems if they have the same itineraries. By controlling the deficiency of the subeigenvector, we get good expansive properties for $g$ (no homtervals), which in turn allows us to verify the continuity of $\psi$. Now we set to the real work of writing down all the details.

*Proof.* Denote by $A$ the transition matrix and by $v$ the $\lambda$-subeigenvector. We may assume $v$ has been scaled so that the sum of its entries is 1. We will construct

a homeomorphism $\psi$ such that $\psi \circ f \circ \psi^{-1}$ has Lipschitz constant $\lambda$. We use throughout the proof the notation and results of Lemma 4.2. We begin by defining $\psi$ on the sets $P^n$ (and hence on $Q$). Define

$$\Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_n]) := \frac{v_{I_n}}{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{I_i}}, \qquad \lambda_J := \frac{(Av)_J}{v_J} \leq \lambda, \tag{4}$$

where the empty product (when $n = 0$) is taken to be 1. This definition has the following two good properties:

$$\sum_{I_{n+1} \subseteq f(I_n)} \Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_n I_{n+1}]) = \frac{1}{\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_{I_i}} \frac{\sum_{I_{n+1} \subseteq f(I_n)} v_{I_{n+1}}}{\lambda_{I_n}} = \Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_n]), \tag{5}$$

$$\Delta\psi([I_1 \cdots I_n]) = \lambda_{I_0} \cdot \Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_n]). \tag{6}$$

Notice that $P^n \subset P^{n+1}$ and that each $[I_0 \cdots I_n] \in \mathcal{B}(P^n)$ is subdivided in the partition $P^{n+1}$ into the intervals $[I_0 \cdots I_n I_{n+1}]$, where $I_{n+1}$ ranges over all members of $\mathcal{B}(P)$ contained in $f(I_n)$. It follows by (5) there is no ambiguity in the definition

$$\psi(x) := \sum_{\emptyset \neq [I_0 \cdots I_n] \leq x} \Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_n]), \quad \text{if } x \in P^n. \tag{7}$$

This defines $\psi$ on the set $Q$. Since $0, 1 \in P^0$, we find $\psi(0) = 0$ (the empty sum) and

$$\psi(1) = \sum_{[I_0] \leq 1} \Delta\psi([I_0]) = \sum_{I_0 \in \mathcal{B}(P)} \frac{v_{I_0}}{1} = 1.$$

Strict monotonicity of $\psi$ on each $P^n$ follows because all entries of $v$ are positive. It follows also that $\psi$ is strictly monotone on $Q$.

Suppose now that two points $x, x' \in Q$ belong to a common partition interval $I_0$. Take $n$ minimal so that $x, x' \in P^n$. Notice that $f$ induces a bijective correspondence between the set of intervals $[I_0 \cdots I_n] \in \mathcal{B}(P^n)$ contained in $[x; x']$ (the interval with endpoints $x, x'$) and the set of intervals $[I_1 \cdots I_n] \in \mathcal{B}(P^{n-1})$ contained in $[f(x); f(x')]$. Using (6) and taking sums, we find

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(f(x)) - \psi(f(x'))| &= \sum_{\substack{[I_1 \cdots I_n] \\ \subset [f(x); f(x')]}} \Delta\psi([I_1 \cdots I_n]) = \sum_{\substack{[I_0 \cdots I_n] \\ \subset [x; x']}} \lambda_{I_0} \Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_n]) = \\ &= \lambda_{I_0} |\psi(x) - \psi(x')|, \quad \text{for } x, x' \in Q \text{ in the same interval } I_0. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Even if $x, x' \in Q$ do not belong to a common partition interval, we still have the intermediate value theorem. Therefore for each nonempty $[I_1 \cdots I_n] \subset [f(x); f(x')]$, there is at least one choice of $I_0$ which yields a nonempty $[I_0 \cdots I_n] \subset [x; x']$. Continuing as in (8), we obtain the inequality

$$|\psi(f(x)) - \psi(f(x'))| \leq \lambda |\psi(x) - \psi(x')|, \quad \text{for arbitrary } x, x' \in Q. \tag{9}$$

We claim that we can extend the map $\psi : Q \to [0, 1]$ to a homeomorphism $\psi' : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$ by the rule

$$\psi'(x) = \sup \psi(Q \cap [0, x)),$$

and that the conjugate map $g := \psi' \circ f \circ \psi'^{-1}$ has Lipschitz constant $\lambda$. There are several points here to verify, namely,

(i) $\psi'$ is an extension of $\psi$, i.e., $\psi'(x) = \psi(x)$ for $x \in Q$,
(ii) $\psi'$ is strictly monotone,

(iii) $\psi'$ is continuous, and
(iv) $g$ has Lipschitz constant $\lambda$.

All four points follow quickly if we can verify the equality

$$\sup \psi(Q \cap [0,x)) = \inf \psi(Q \cap (x,1]), \qquad x \in [0,1], \tag{10}$$

holding to the agreement that the empty set has supremum 0 and infimum 1. Point (i) follows from the following observation (using the monotonicity of $\psi$),

$$\sup \psi(Q \cap [0,x)) = \lim_{\substack{y \to x^- \\ y \in Q}} \psi(y) \leq \psi(x) \leq \lim_{\substack{y \to x^+ \\ y \in Q}} \psi(y) = \inf \psi(Q \cap (x,1]). \tag{11}$$

Point (ii) follows from the density of $Q$ and the strict monotonicity of $\psi$. Point (iii) follows from (11) with the middle term replaced by $\psi'(x)$. Point (iv) follows by replacing each $\psi$ in (9) with $\psi'$ and recalling the density of $Q$.

The proof of (10) is quite technical and is deferred to the appendix. □

### 4.2. Salama Entropy

Let $A$ be a countable matrix whose entries are zeros and ones, and whose rows and columns are indexed by some countable set $S$ (as in states). Assume that $A$ is *irreducible*, i.e., for each $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $n \geq 1$ such that $A^n_{ij} > 0$. We associate to $A$ the directed graph $\Gamma$ with vertex set $S$ and with arrows $i \to j$ if and only if $A_{ij} = 1$. A *path* in $\Gamma$ of *length* $n$ is an $n+1$-tuple of vertices, denoted $[i_0 \cdots i_n]$, with the property that there are arrows $i_k \to i_{k+1}$ in $\Gamma$ for each $k = 0, \cdots, n-1$; we say that this path *begins* at $i_0$ and *ends* at $i_n$. The set of all finite paths is denoted $\mathcal{L}$ (as in language). A *loop* is a path which begins and ends at the same vertex. Irreducibility of $A$ tells us that $\Gamma$ is *connected*, i.e., for any pair of vertices $i, j$, there exists a path which begins at $i$ and ends at $j$. An *infinite path* in $\Gamma$ is a sequence of vertices $i_0 i_1 i_2 \ldots \in S^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the property that there are arrows $i_k \to i_{k+1}$ in $\Gamma$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The *topological Markov chain* associated with $A$ is the dynamical system $(\Sigma, \sigma)$ where $\Sigma \subset S^{\mathbb{N}}$ consists of all infinite paths in $\Gamma$ and $\sigma : \Sigma \to \Sigma$ is the shift transformation $i_0 i_1 \ldots \mapsto i_1 i_2 \ldots$. We define a topology on $\Sigma$ by giving $S$ the discrete topology, $S^{\mathbb{N}}$ the product topology, and $\Sigma \subset S^{\mathbb{N}}$ the inherited subspace topology. Then the irreducibility of $A$ corresponds to the *topological transitivity* of $(\Sigma, \sigma)$.

We wish to relate the subeigenvalues of $A$ to the entropy of $\Sigma$. However, in the absence of compactness, we have to specify carefully which entropy we have in mind. We follow the approaches of Gurevich [6] and Salama [15], and define entropy by counting paths in $\Gamma$.

$$\begin{aligned} p^{(n)}_{ab} &:= (A^n)_{ab} = \#\{[i_0 \cdots i_n] \in \mathcal{L} : i_0 = a, i_n = b\}, \\ p^{(n)}_{a\bullet} &:= \textstyle\sum_b (A^n)_{ab} = \#\{[i_0 \cdots i_n] \in \mathcal{L} : i_0 = a\}, \\ p^{(n)}_{\bullet b} &:= \textstyle\sum_a (A^n)_{ab} = \#\{[i_0 \cdots i_n] \in \mathcal{L} : i_n = b\}. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

We will consider three kinds of entropy. All three are defined in terms of fixed vertices $a, b$; transitivity gives that the choice of $a, b$ is arbitrary. They are

$$\begin{aligned} h_{Gur}(\Sigma) &:= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{ab}^{(n)}, \quad \text{the } \textit{Gurevich entropy} \text{ of } \Sigma, \\ h_{Sal}(\Sigma) &:= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{a\bullet}^{(n)}, \quad \text{the } \textit{Salama entropy} \text{ of } \Sigma, \text{ and} \\ h_{RevSal}(\Sigma) &:= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log p_{\bullet b}^{(n)}, \quad \text{the } \textit{reverse Salama entropy} \text{ of } \Sigma. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Reverse Salama entropy is nothing more than the Salama entropy of the chain we obtain by taking the transpose of $A$ (or equivalently, by reversing the direction of all arrows in the graph $\Gamma$). Nevertheless, reverse Salama entropy plays a key role in the study of the subeigenvalues of $A$, as we will see.

**Remark 4.5.** More generally, we can allow our irreducible matrix $A$ to take values in $\mathbb{N}$. Then we form a graph $\Gamma$ with $A_{ij}$ distinct arrows from $i$ to $j$. The elements of the chain $\Sigma$ are then taken to be the sequences of edges $\xi_0\xi_1\cdots$ from $\Gamma$ such that each $\xi_i$ terminates in the initial vertex of $\xi_{i+1}$ – this is called the *edge shift* of $\Gamma$ in contrast with the *vertex shifts* defined earlier. Edge shifts are also topological Markov chains, since the edge shift of $\Gamma$ is just the vertex shift of the dual graph $\Gamma'$ (the vertices of $\Gamma'$ are taken to be the edges of $\Gamma$ and there are arrows $\xi \to \eta$ if and only if $\xi$ can be followed by $\eta$ in $\Gamma$).

In this case, we modify the path counts defined in equations (12) and (14) so as to count paths with multiplicities, where the *multiplicity* of a path $[i_0 \cdots i_n]$ is $A_{i_0 i_1} \cdot A_{i_1 i_2} \cdot \ldots \cdot A_{i_{n-1} i_n}$. With these modified path counts, all results in this section continue to hold as written (as the diligent reader may verify), provided we assume that $A$ has *finite row and column sums*, so that $\Gamma$ has finitely many edges entering and exiting each vertex. This is an essential hypothesis; it shows that we can keep counting paths which start / end with some fixed vertices in $\Gamma$, instead of counting paths which start / end with some fixed edges. Clearly the counts are related – eg., $p_{a\bullet}^{(n)}(\Gamma) = \sum_\xi p_{\xi\bullet}^{(n-1)}(\Gamma')$, where the sum is taken over the edges $\xi$ in $\Gamma$ with initial vertex $a$. The key observation, then, is that finitely many sequences with a common exponential growth rate have a sum with the same exponential growth rate.

In the sequel, we will need an alternative characterization of Salama entropy as the growth rate of the number of paths which begin at an arbitrary fixed vertex $a$ but do not return to $a$. Thus we define the path counts

$$\begin{aligned} {}_c p_{ab}^{(n)} &:= \#\{[i_0 \cdots i_n] \in \mathcal{L} : i_0 = a, i_n = b, i_j \neq c, 1 \leq j \leq n-1\}, \\ {}_c p_{a\bullet}^{(n)} &:= \#\{[i_0 \cdots i_n] \in \mathcal{L} : i_0 = a, i_j \neq c, 1 \leq j \leq n\}, \\ {}_c p_{\bullet b}^{(n)} &:= \#\{[i_0 \cdots i_n] \neq \emptyset : i_n = b, i_j \neq c, 0 \leq j \leq n-1\}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

**Theorem 4.6.** *In a transitive, countable-state, topological Markov chain $\Sigma$,*

$$h_{Sal}(\Sigma) > h_{Gur}(\Sigma) \implies h_{Sal}(\Sigma) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log {}_a p_{a\bullet}^{(n)},$$

*where $a \in S$ is an arbitrary fixed vertex. Similarly,*

$$h_{RevSal}(\Sigma) > h_{Gur}(\Sigma) \implies h_{RevSal}(\Sigma) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log {}_a p^{(n)}_{\bullet b},$$

*Proof.* The inequality $h_{Sal}(\Sigma) \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log {}_a p^{(n)}_{a\bullet}$ is obvious from the definitions. For the reverse inequality, it suffices to show that the radius of convergence of the power series $\sum p^{(n)}_{a\bullet} z^n$ is greater than or equal to that of $\sum {}_a p^{(n)}_{a\bullet} z^n$.

Every length $n$ path $[ai_1 \cdots i_n]$ can be represented uniquely as the concatenation of a length $k$ loop $[ai_1 \cdots i_{k-1}a]$, $k = \max\{j \in \{0, \ldots, n\} : i_j = a\}$ and a length $n-k$ path $[ai_{k+1} \cdots i_{n-1}i_n]$ which does not return to $a$. Therefore we obtain the product identity

$$\underbrace{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p^{(n)}_{a\bullet} z^n}_{\substack{\text{convergence radius:} \\ \exp -h_{Sal}(\Sigma)}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n} p^{(k)}_{aa} \, {}_a p^{(n-k)}_{a\bullet} \right) z^n = \underbrace{\left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p^{(n)}_{aa} z^n \right)}_{\substack{\text{convergence radius:} \\ \exp -h_{Gur}(\Sigma)}} \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} {}_a p^{(n)}_{a\bullet} z^n \right)$$

The radius of convergence of a product of concentric power series is at least the minimum of the radii of the factors. Since the Salama entropy was assumed to be strictly larger than the Gurevich entropy, we are finished.

Finally, to get the similar statement regarding reverse Salama entropy, simply apply the original statement to the chain obtained from the transpose of $A$. □

**Corollary 4.7.** *In a transitive, countable-state, topological Markov chain $\Sigma$,*

$$h_{Sal}(\Sigma) = \max \left\{ h_{Gur}(\Sigma), \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log {}_a p^{(n)}_{a\bullet} \right\}.$$

*The analogous statement holds for the reverse Salama entropy.*

We remark that Theorem 4.6 is false if we remove the assumption that Salama entropy strictly exceeds Gurevich entropy. For example, consider the chain in Figure 4.2, for which the Salama entropy and Gurevich entropy are both the logarithm of the golden mean, whereas ${}_a p^{(n)}_{a\bullet} = 0$ for $n \geq 2$.

### 4.3. Subeigenvalues and Reverse Salama Entropy

Now we are ready to relate the subeigenvalues of the irreducible, countable zero-one matrix $A$ to the entropies of the associated topological Markov chain $\Sigma$. We use the following power series.

$$P_{ka}(z) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p^{(n)}_{ka} z^n, \qquad {}_a P_{ka}(z) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} {}_a p^{(n)}_{ka} z^n.$$

**Proposition 4.8** (Pruitt, [14])**.** *If $A$ admits a positive $\lambda$-subeigenvector, then $\lambda \geq \exp h_{Gur}(\Sigma)$. Conversely, If $\lambda > \exp h_{Gur}(\Sigma)$, then $A$ admits a positive $\lambda$-subeigenvector with deficiency in only one coordinate.*

We include Pruitt's proof of the converse statement, since we will need the construction later.

*Proof.* Fix $a \in S$. Form a vector $v$ with entries $v_k := P_{ka}(\lambda^{-1})$. For each $i \in S$,

$$\lambda^{-1} \sum_k A_{ik} v_k \;=\; \lambda^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_k A_{ik} p_{ka}^{(n)} \lambda^{-n} \;=\; \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{ia}^{(n+1)} \lambda^{-(n+1)} \;=\; v_i \,-\, \delta_{ia}.$$

Thus $v$ is a $\lambda$-subeigenvector for $A$ with deficiency in only the coordinate $a$. □

**Lemma 4.9** (Pruitt, [14])**.** *If $v$ is a $\lambda$-subeigenvector for $A$, then $v_k \geq v_a \cdot {}_a P_{ka}(\lambda^{-1})$ for all $a, k \in S$.*

**Theorem 4.10.** *If $A$ admits a positive and summable $\lambda$-subeigenvector, then $\lambda \geq \exp h_{RevSal}(\Sigma)$. Conversely, If $\lambda > \exp h_{RevSal}(\Sigma)$, then $A$ admits a positive summable $\lambda$-subeigenvector with deficiency in only one coordinate.*

*Proof.* Suppose $A$ admits a positive summable $\lambda$-subeigenvector $v$. If $h_{RevSal}(\Sigma) = h_{Gur}(\Sigma)$, then by Proposition 4.8 we are finished. Assume henceforth that $h_{RevSal}(\Sigma) > h_{Gur}(\Sigma)$. Fix $a \in S$. By Lemma 4.9 and the summability of $v$,

$$v_a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} {}_a p_{\bullet a}^{(n)} \lambda^{-n} = v_a \sum_{k \neq a} {}_a P_{ka}(\lambda^{-1}) \leq v_a \sum_{k \in S} {}_a P_{ka}(\lambda^{-1}) \leq \sum_{k \in S} v_k < \infty.$$

Since the coefficients ${}_a p_{\bullet a}^{(n)}$ grow like the reverse Salama entropy, it follows that $\lambda \geq \exp h_{RevSal}(\Sigma)$.

Now suppose $\lambda > \exp h_{RevSal}(\Sigma)$. Define $v$ as in the proof of Proposition 4.8. We need only verify the summability of $v$. We have

$$\sum_k v_k = \sum_k \sum_n p_{ka}^{(n)} \lambda^{-n} = \sum_n p_{\bullet a}^{(n)} \lambda^{-n}.$$

Convergence follows from the condition on $\lambda$. □

### 4.4. The Infimum of Lipschitz Constants

We are now ready to state our main result for transitive interval maps admitting countable Markov partitions. We give two characterizations of the infimum of Lipschitz constants $\Lambda(f)$ – one extrinsic, in terms of the associated Markov chain, and the other intrinsic, in terms of the growth rate of the number of preimages under $f$ of a (nearly) arbitrary point from the interval.

**Theorem 4.11.** *Let $f$ be transitive and countably Markov with partition set $P$. Let $\Sigma$ be the associated topological Markov chain. Then*

$$\log \Lambda(f) = h_{RevSal}(\Sigma) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \# f^{-n}(\{x\}),$$

*for any $x \in [0,1] \setminus \mathrm{Acc}(P)$.*

*Proof.* The first equality follows from Proposition 4.3, Theorem 4.4, and Theorem 4.10.

Now fix $x \in [0,1] \setminus \mathrm{Acc}(P)$. We need to show that the number of iterated preimages of $x$ grows like $h_{RevSal}(\Sigma)$. We use the sets $P^n$ and the corresponding partition intervals as described in Lemma 4.2. We also use the observation that $\mathrm{Acc}(P)$ is invariant. Therefore $x$ itself and every one of its iterated preimages belongs to the closure of at least one and at most two of the partition intervals $\mathcal{B}(P)$.

Suppose first that $x$ is in one of our (open) partition intervals $J \in \mathcal{B}(P)$. Fix $n$. The number $p_{\bullet J}^{(n)}$ is the number of nonempty intervals $[I_0 \cdots I_n]$ with $I_n = J$. Each of these intervals is mapped homeomorphically by $f^n$ onto $J$, yielding $p_{\bullet J}^{(n)}$ distinct preimages for $x$ under $f^n$. There are no other preimages: the other partition intervals of $P^n$ have images under $f^n$ disjoint from $J$. Taking logarithms and sending $n \to \infty$, the result follows.

Now suppose that $x$ is the common endpoint of two consecutive partition intervals $J, K$. Fix $n$. We have

$$\frac{1}{2} p_{\bullet J}^{(n)} \leq \# f^{-n}(\{x\}) \leq p_{\bullet J}^{(n)} + p_{\bullet K}^{(n)}.$$

The left-hand inequality is because because each nonempty interval $[I_0 \cdots I_n]$ with $I_n = J$ has an endpoint mapped by $f^n$ to $x$, and each such endpoint can belong to at most two such intervals. The right-hand inequality is because any interval $[I_0 \cdots I_n]$ containing an $n$th preimage of $x$ must have $I_n = J$ or else $I_n = K$. Exponential growth rate is not affected by dividing by 2, and if two sequences have a common exponential growth rate, then so does their sum. □

By way of contrast, we record the following theorem of Bobok and Bruin, which says that the topological entropy of a countably Markov interval map is given by the Gurevich entropy of the corresponding topological Markov chain.

**Theorem 4.12** ([5])**.** *Let $f$ be countably Markov with partition set $P$. Let $\Sigma$ be the associated topological Markov chain. Then*

$$h(f) = h_{Gur}(\Sigma).$$

We cannot help but notice that the class of maps treated in our Theorem 4.11 overlaps in part with the class treated by Parry [13] (transitive, piecewise monotone, not necessarily Markov), for which $\Lambda(f) = \exp h(f)$ (Parry gave a conjugate map with constant slope, $\lambda = \pm \exp h(f)$). But this is not a problem, because for the maps Parry considers, topological entropy coincides with the growth rate of the number of preimages of a point. This is the content of a forthcoming theorem by Misiurewicz and Rodrigues (proved in [8] for topologically mixing maps; but a trivial modification of the proof using Lemma 4.1 gives the strengthened result.)

**Theorem 4.13** ([8])**.** *Suppose $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is transitive and (finitely) piecewise monotone. Then $h(f) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \# f^{-n}(x)$ for any $x \in [0,1]$.*

As a consequence, we can view our Theorem 4.11 as a natural analogue to Parry's result. The penalty we pay for allowing countable Markov partitions is that the limit is replaced by a lim sup, and the point $x$ is no longer completely arbitrary.

### 4.5. An Example

We reconsider an interval map $f$ from [9], where it was proven that $f$ admits no conjugate map of constant slope, i.e., piecewise linear with each piece sharing a common absolute value of slope. Since $f$ cannot be "linearized," it is natural to search instead for conjugate maps with small Lipschitz constants.

**Example 4.14.** Let $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be the piecewise linear map with turning points $z \mapsto z - 1$ and $z + \frac{3}{5} \mapsto z + 2$ for $z \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then choose a homeomorphism $h : \mathbb{R} \to (0,1)$ and define $f := h \circ F \circ h^{-1}$ with additional fixed points at $0, 1$. Take

$P = h(\mathbb{Z}) \cup h(\mathbb{Z}+\frac{3}{5})$. Clearly $f$ is countably Markov with partition set $P$. Moreover, $f$ is transitive by [9, Theorem 5.4].

Every point of the interval, except the endpoints, has exactly 5 preimages, and so by Theorem 4.11 we see that $\Lambda(f) = 5$. In light of Theorem 4.12, we can compute the topological entropy of $f$ as the Gurevich entropy of the associated Markov chain. The state space consists of the partition intervals, which we label by the rule $I_n = (h(n), h(n+\frac{3}{5}))$, $J_n = (h(n+\frac{3}{5}), h(n+1))$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Figure 4.5 pictures $f$ (with $P$ superimposed) as well as the associated directed graph $\Gamma$. There is an obvious topological conjugacy between the vertex shift of $\Gamma$ and the edge shift (see Remark 4.5) of the simpler graph $\Gamma'$ (also pictured in Figure 4.5) corresponding to the matrix $A'$ with entries $A'_{n,n+1} = A'_{n,n} = 2$, $A'_{n,n-1} = 1$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. If we use the labeling as shown in Figure 4.5, then this conjugacy is given explicitly by the formula $\phi(x_0 x_1 \cdots) = (x_0, n_1 - n_0)(x_1, n_2 - n_1)\cdots$, where $n_i$ is the integer such that $x_i \in \{I_{n_i}, J_{n_i}\}$. Gurevich entropy is an invariant of topological conjugacy, and so we have $h(f) = h_{Gur}(\Sigma')$, where $\Sigma'$ is the edge shift of $\Gamma'$.

Now we apply a method from [5] to compute $h_{Gur}(\Sigma')$. Since each row of $A'$ has only finitely many nonzero entries, this entropy is characterized by the property that $A'$ has a nonnegative $\lambda$-eigenvector if and only if $\lambda \geq h_{Gur}(\Sigma')$ (This is [5, Corollary 1], a corollary of [14, Theorem 2]). The eigenvectors of $A'$ can be found by solving the linear difference equation $v_{i-1} + 2v_i + 2v_{i+1} = \lambda v_i$, whose characteristic polynomial is $m^2 + (2-\lambda)m + 1 = 0$. The difference equation admits a nonnegative solution if and only if the characteristic polynomial has at least one positive real root, which happens if and only if $\lambda \geq 2 + 2\sqrt{2}$. Thus $f$ has topological entropy $\log(2+2\sqrt{2}) \approx \log(4.828)$, and there is a gap $\Lambda(f) > \exp h(f)$.




FIGURE 1. The map $f$, its graph $\Gamma$, and a simpler graph $\Gamma'$ whose edge shift is conjugate to the vertex shift of $\Gamma$.

## 5. Appendix

We finish the proof of Theorem 4.4 by supplying the justification for equation (10).

*Proof.* Suppose first that $x \notin Q$. Then each point $f^n(x)$ belongs to a unique partition interval $I_n \in \mathcal{B}(P)$. (The sequence $I_0 I_1 \cdots$ is usually called the *itinerary* of $x$). We are interested in the nested sequence of intervals $[I_0 I_1 \cdots I_n]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, each of which contains $x$. By the density of $Q$, the endpoints of these intervals are converging to $x$. Therefore,

$$\sup \psi(Q \cap [0,x)) - \inf \psi(Q \cap (x,1]) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_n]).$$

The terms in the limit are monotone decreasing by the monotonicity of $\psi$ – we must show that they decrease to zero. Suppose first that some symbol $J$ occurs infinitely often in the itinerary of $x$. Among all partition intervals contained in $f(J)$ there must exist some $L$ with $\frac{v_L}{\lambda_J v_J}$ maximal; call this ratio $c$ and notice that $c < 1$. We have

$$\Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots JK]) = \frac{v_K}{\lambda_J v_J}\Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots J]) \leq c\Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots J]).$$

Therefore our decreasing sequence shrinks by the factor $c$ or better infinitely many times, and hence converges to zero. Suppose now that each symbol in the itinerary of $x$ occurs only finitely often. By hypothesis, we have $\lambda_J = \lambda > 1$ for all but finitely many intervals $J \in \mathcal{B}(P)$. Since these intervals can occur only finitely many times in the itinerary, we find that the denominator in the expression for $\Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_n])$ in (4) is eventually monotone increasing with respect to $n$, growing by a factor of $\lambda$ at each step. Moreover, the numerator in this expression is always bounded by 1. Therefore the limit is zero, as desired.

Now suppose $x \in Q$. We will show that $\psi(x) = \inf \psi(Q \cap (x, 1])$. The proof that $\psi(x) = \sup \psi(Q \cap [0, x))$ is similar. There are two possibilities to consider. Either for each $n \geq 0$ the set $P^n \cap (x, 1]$ has a minimum element $x_n$, or else for some $n_0$, the set $P^{n_0} \cap (x, 1]$ accumulates at $x$. In the first case we obtain an "itinerary" $I_0 I_1 \cdots$ defined by the property that for each $n$, $[I_0 \cdots I_n]$ is the component $(x, x_n)$ of $[0, 1] \setminus P^n$. Then $\inf \psi(Q \cap (x, 1])$ is given by the monotone decreasing limit $\lim \Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_n])$ and we proceed as before. In the second case we obtain a whole sequence of points $y_i \in P^{n_0}$ which converge monotonically $y_i \searrow x$. We may apply the definition (7) to calculate

$$\begin{aligned}\inf \psi(Q \cap (x, 1]) - \psi(x) = \lim_{i\to\infty} \psi(y_i) - \psi(x) &= \lim_{i\to\infty} \sum_{\substack{[I_0\cdots I_{n_0}]\neq\emptyset \\ x\leq[I_0\cdots I_{n_0}]\leq y_i}} \Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_{n_0}]) \\ &= \lim_{i\to\infty} \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{[I_0\cdots I_{n_0}]\neq\emptyset \\ y_{j+1}\leq[I_0\cdots I_{n_0}]\leq y_j}} \Delta\psi([I_0 \cdots I_{n_0}]) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

The rearrangement of the sum is justified because for each nonempty $[I_0 \cdots I_{n_0}]$ between $x$ and $y_i$ there is exactly one $j \geq i$ such that $y_{j+1} \leq [I_0 \cdots I_{n_0}] \leq y_j$, and because a convergent series of nonnegative terms may be rearranged at will. The limit is zero because it is the limit of the tail sums of a convergent series.

□

## References


[1] Ll. Alsedà, J. Llibre and M. Misiurewicz, *Combinatorial Dynamics and Entropy in Dimension One*, 2nd edition, Advanced Series in Nonlinear Dynamics **5**, World Scientific, Singapore, 2000.

[2] M. Barge and J. Martin, Chaos, periodicity, and snakelike continua. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **289** (1985), no. 1, 355–365.

[3] M. Barge and J. Martin, Dense orbits on the interval. *Michigan Math. J.* **34** (1987), no. 1, 311.

[4] J. Bobok, On Lipschitz extension of interval maps. *Qual. Theory Dyn. Syst.* **4** (2003), no. 1, 17–30.

[5] J. Bobok and H. Bruin, Conjugacy to a map of constant slope II. *Preprint.*

[6] B. Gurevič, Topological entropy of a countable Markov chain. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **187** (1969), 715–718.

[7] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
[8] M. Misiurewicz and A. Rodrigues, Counting preimages. *Preprint*, www.math.iupui.edu/ mmisiure/publlist.html.
[9] M. Misiurewicz and S. Roth, No semiconjugacy to a map of constant slope. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **36** (2016), no. 3, 875–889.
[10] M. Misiurewicz and W. Szlenk, Entropy of piecewise monotone mappings. *Studia Math.* **67** (1980), no. 1, 45–63.
[11] J. Milnor and W. Thurston, On iterated maps of the interval. *Dynamical Systems (Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1342)*. Springer, Berlin, 1988, pp. 465-563.
[12] J. von Neumann and S.M. Ulam, On combination of stochastic and deterministic processes. Bull. A.M.S. **33** (1947), 1120
[13] W. Parry, Symbolic dynamics and transformations of the unit interval. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **122** (1966), 368–378.
[14] W. Pruitt, Eigenvalues of non-negative matrices. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **35** (1964), 1979–1800.
[15] I. Salama, Topological entropy and recurrence of countable chains. *Pacific J. Math.* **134** (1988), no. 2, 325–341.
[16] S. Silverman, On maps with dense orbits and the definition of chaos. *Rocky Mountain Jour. Math.* **22** (1992), 353–375.

Czech Technical University in Prague, FCE, Thákurova 7, 166 29 Praha 6, Czech Republic
*E-mail address*: jozef.bobok@cvut.cz
*URL*: http://mat.fsv.cvut.cz/bobok/

Silesian University in Opava, Na Rybničku 626/1, 746 01 Opava, Czech Republic
*E-mail address*: samuel.roth@math.slu.cz